

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-39 are presently active in this case. Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 13-17, 20-23, 25, 26, 28-31, 33-35, and 37-39 are amended to clarify features recited therein. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found at least at page 26, lines 8-16 of the specification and Fig. 1.

Applicant and Applicant's representative wish to thank Examiner Bates and Primary Examiner Winder for the interview granted on January 5, 2004. During that interview, the outstanding rejections were discussed in detail. Further, during the interview amended claims along the lines presented herewith were discussed and arguments as hereinafter discussed were presented. During the interview, the Examiners indicated that such amended claims appeared to distinguish over the current rejections, and that they would update their search in view of the amended claims when such amended claims are formally presented in a filed response.

The outstanding Office Action rejects Claims 31-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable by Iida (U.S. Patent No. 5,900,608, herein "Iida") in view of Simpson (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,300); rejects Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-16, 18-22, and 24-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Iida in view of Keller, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,172,948, herein "Keller"); and rejects Claims 2, 8, 10, 17, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Iida in view of Keller, and further in view of Saeki, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,597,862, herein "Saeki").

Rejection of Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-16, 18-22, and 24-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-16, 18-22, and 24-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Lida in view of Keller. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites an information processing device connected to at least another information processing device via a network, said information processing device comprising, *inter alia*, obtaining means for obtaining capacity information relating to the capacity of the information notified by notifying means from a second database provided in the other information processing devices via the network, the information being stored in a first database provided in the at least another information processing device.

The outstanding Office Action points out that “Lida does not explicitly indicate an obtaining means for obtaining capacity information relating to the capacity of said information notified by said notifying means from said other information processing devices via said network.”¹ The outstanding Office Action asserts that “Keller teaches an obtaining means for obtaining capacity information relating to the capacity of said information notified by said notifying means from said other information processing devices via said network.”²

However, Keller does not teach or suggest an information processing device comprising obtaining means for obtaining capacity information relating to the capacity of the information from a second database provided in at least another information processing device via a network, whereas the information is stored in a first database, as recited in Claim 1. As discussed above, the outstanding Office Action cites col. 12, lines 64-67 and col. 15, lines 52-57 of Keller; however, the above-referenced obtaining means of Claim 1 is not taught or suggested there. Col. 12, lines 64-67 of Keller states that “the central processing unit 94 can cause the digital data to be saved in the data storage structure 106 as one or more

¹ Office Action, page 5.

² Citing col. 12, lines 64-67 and col. 15, lines 52-57 of Keller.

digital files . . .”; and Col. 15, lines 52-57 of Keller teaches a display device. However, Keller is silent as to obtaining capacity information relating to the capacity of the information from a second database provided in at least another information processing device via a network, wherein the information is stored in a first database provided in at least another information processing device. Nowhere does Keller teach or suggest obtaining means for obtaining capacity information relating to the capacity of the information notified by notifying means from a second database provided in the other information processing devices via the network, the information being stored in a first database provided in the at least another information processing device, as recited in Claim 1, as amended.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Independent Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 20, 21, and 30, although of different statutory class and/or of different scope, include recitations similar to those in Claim 1 discussed above. Claims 3, 4, 18, and 19 depend from Claims 1 or 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 3-6, 15, 16, 18-21, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

Claim 7, recites an information processing device connected to at least another information processing device via a network comprising, *inter alia*, second obtaining means for obtaining capacity information relating to the capacity of provided information corresponding to specifying information obtained by first obtaining means from a first database and third obtaining means for obtaining the provided information corresponding to the specifying information obtained by the first obtaining means from a second database.

As similarly discussed above with respect to Claim 1, Keller is silent as to second obtaining means for obtaining capacity information relating to the capacity of provided information from a first database and third obtaining means for obtaining the provided

information from a second database, as recited in Claim 7, as amended. Iida does not cure the deficiencies of Keller in this regard. For example, even assuming Iida could properly be combined with Keller, which Applicant disputes, Iida does not teach or suggest, at least, second obtaining means for obtaining capacity information relating to the capacity of provided information from a first database and third obtaining means for obtaining the provided information from a second database, as recited in Claim 7, as amended.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Independent Claims 13, 14, 22, 28, and 29, although of different statutory class and/or of different scope, include recitations similar to those in Claim 7 discussed above. Similarly, Claims 9, 11, 12, and 24-27 depend from Claims 7 or 22. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 9, 11-14, 22, and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2, 8, 10, 17, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2, 8, 10, 17, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Iida in view of Keller, and further in view of Saeki. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 2 and 17 depend on Claims 1 or 16. As discussed above, Claims 1 and 16 are patentable over Iida in view of Keller. Saeki does not cure the deficiencies of Iida and Keller. For example, even assuming Iida and Keller could be combined with Saeki, which Applicant disputes, Saeki does not teach or suggest at least obtaining means for obtaining capacity information relating to the capacity of information notified by notifying means from a second database provided in at least another information processing device via a network, whereas the information is stored in a first database provided in at least another information processing device, as recited in Claim 1 and as similarly recited in Claim 16. Therefore,

Claims 2 and 17 are allowable at least for the reasons provided above with respect to Claims 1 and 16 and also by virtue of their dependency on Claims 1 or 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 2 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Claims 8, 10, and 23 depend on Claims 7 or 22. As discussed above, Claims 7 and 22 are patentable over Iida in view of Keller. Saeki does not cure the deficiencies of Iida and Keller. For example, even assuming Iida and Keller could be combined with Saeki, which Applicant disputes, Saeki does not teach or suggest at least second obtaining means for obtaining capacity information relating to the capacity of provided information from a first database and third obtaining means for obtaining the provided information from a second database, as recited in Claim 7, as amended, and as similarly recited in Claim 22, as amended. Therefore, Claims 8, 10, and 23 are allowable at least for the reasons provided above with respect to Claims 7 and 22 and also by virtue of their dependency on Claims 7 and 22. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 8, 10, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Rejection of Claims 31-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 31-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Iida in view of Simpson. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 31, as amended, recites an information processing device connected to at least another information processing device via a network, the information processing device including, *inter alia*, second obtaining means for obtaining label printing conditions through a GUI regarding which the display thereof is controlled by display control means, the label printing conditions including whether to print on the label a title piece number, an artist name, and playing time of music piece data, and requesting means for requesting printing of a

label, to the at least another information processing device via said network, under said label printing conditions obtained by said second obtaining means, wherein the music piece data is stored in a first database provided in said at least another information processing device and the playing time is stored in a second database provided in said at least another information processing device.

The outstanding Office Action points out that "Ida does not explicitly indicate that the label printing conditions are customizable enough to print things other than the title piece number, an artist name, and playing time."³ The outstanding Office Action asserts that "Simpson teaches a system which creates customized cd's [*sic*] online and allows the user to personalize the label/jewel case that included with the CD to allow the user to customize the default information taken from the contents of the CD (Column 9, lines 29-31) and it allows the users to change the default information and add personalized messages and text (Column 9, lines 15-35)."⁴

However, Simpson does not teach or suggest second obtaining means for obtaining label printing conditions through a GUI, wherein the label printing conditions include whether to print on a label a title piece number, an artist name, and playing time, as recited in Claim 31, as amended. As discussed above, the outstanding Office Action cites column 9, lines 15-35 of Simpson; however, the above-mentioned second obtaining means feature is not disclosed Simpson. Simpson provides

... a gift card, as well as a method and system for enabling the purchaser of the gift card to personalize the gift card for the desired recipient thereof.⁵

Preferably, the front and back card portions constitute a conventional compact disk case 54, sometimes known and a "jewel case" or "CD box".⁶

³ Page 3 of the Office Action of October 6, 2004.

⁴ Id.

⁵ Col. 3, lines 19-22 of Simpson.

⁶ Col. 3, lines 45-48 of Simpson.

The preferred process of customization includes the following five main steps: providing basic demographics about the recipient (FIG. 5); writing a personal message (FIG. 6); setting product specific attributes (FIG. 7); reviewing current selections (FIG. 8); and selecting a wrap/box (FIG. 9).⁷

The [third] step in the customization process involves editing the appearance and assets to be selected by the CD for presentation to the recipient, as shown in FIG. 7.⁸

When the card's recipient receives the CD card, and puts it into the CD drive on a computer . . . a program begins that is stored on the CD provided with the card. Preferably, the program uses the data entered by the purchaser of the card to select the type of information which will be displayed to the recipient on the computer.⁹

[The] product code and the personal message are printed on a greeting card that accompanies the CD 62.¹⁰

In other words, in Simpson, the customization process includes writing a personal message on a label and selecting the type of information to be displayed to the recipient, wherein the information is stored on a CD. By designating content options, the user selects information to be displayed upon playing of the CD. The personal message is printed on a label; however, Simpson is silent as to obtaining label printing conditions through a GUI, wherein the label printing conditions include whether to print on a label a title piece number, an artist name, and playing time, as recited in Claim 31, as amended.

Moreover, both Iida and Simpson are silent as to storing music piece data in a first database and storing the playing time of the music piece data in a second database, as recited in Claim 31, as amended.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of Claim 31. Amended independent Claims 33-35 and 37-39, although of different statutory

⁷ Col. 9, lines 58-64 of Simpson.

⁸ Col. 9, lines 26-29 of Simpson.

⁹ Col. 5, line 44-col. 6, line 5 of Simpson.

¹⁰ Col. 9, lines 43-44 of Simpson.

class and/or of different scope, include recitations similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 31. Claims 32 and 36 depend from Claims 31 or 35. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 32-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application, including Claims 1-39, is patentably distinguished over the prior art, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at an early date.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073